

**Remarks**

**Status of the Subject Application**

The Title was objected to as being not descriptive.

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to because of a typographical error.

The lone pending claim 1 was objected to for minor informalities.

Claim 1 was also rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 5,602,674 to Weissman et al. (hereinafter "Weissman") with support from Merriam-Webster online dictionary.

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent 5,793,969 to Kamensky et al. (hereinafter "Kamensky").

**In the Title**

The Title was objected to as being not descriptive. The Examiner stated that a new title was required that was clearly indicative of the invention to which the claim was directed. Though Applicants respectfully submit that the original Title is descriptive of the invention of the original claim and the new claims, Applicants have amended the Title for purposes of clarification and expediency to now read "SYSTEM FOR REMOTE VIEWING AND DISPLAY OF A SLIDE." Applicants believe this title is consistent with the current subject matter of the claims and is generally supported throughout the Subject Application.

**In the Specification**

Page 8 of the specification has been amended to add paragraph numbers and correct typographical errors therein. Additionally, original claim 1 on page 8, now canceled, has been incorporated into the written description of the specification by the amendment shown above.

**In the Abstract**

The Abstract was objected to because on line 7 there was a misplaced ":" that should have been a quotation mark. This typographical error has been corrected as shown in the amendment above.

**In the Claims**

Claim 1 has been canceled.

Claims 2-35 have been added.

Applicants submit that the new claims 2, 16, and 27 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 3, paragraph [008], page 4, paragraph [011] through page 5, paragraph [014], page 6, paragraph [018] through page 7, paragraph [019], Figure 2, and generally throughout the application.

Applicants submit that the new claims 3-4, 17, and 28 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 3, paragraph [008] through page 4, paragraph [010], Figures 1 and 2, and generally throughout the application.

Applicants submit that the new claims 5-6, 9-13, 18-24, and 29-33 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 4, paragraph [011] through page 5, paragraph [014], Figure 2, and generally throughout the application.

Applicants submit that the new claims 7-8 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 5, paragraph [014] through page 7, paragraph [019], and generally through the application.

Applicants submit that the new claims 14-15, 25-26, and 34-35 are supported in the Subject Application, for example, at page 4, paragraph [013], page 5, paragraph [015] through page 7, paragraph [019], and generally through the application.

**Objections and Rejections to Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been canceled, and thus Examiner's objection for minor informalities, and also rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 par. 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the

applicant regards as the invention, §102(b) based on Weissman with support from Merriam-Webster online dictionary ("remote" definition), and §102(e) based upon Kamentsky are not specifically discussed. Applicants do not thereby admit the propriety of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1. However, the objection and rejections were carefully considered in drafting new claims 2-35 discussed below.

### **New Claims 2-35**

Applicants submit that neither Weissman nor Kamentsky discloses or suggests the system of claim 2 of the Subject Application. For example, Applicants submit that neither Weissman nor Kamentsky discloses or suggests a system that includes a single display to show an image of a portion of the slide and to show a plurality of control features that include one or more first selections to command the microscopy system to capture a real time version of an other image of at least part of the slide and to transmit the captured image to the single display, and one or more second selections to command a previously-captured version of the other image to be transmitted to the single display.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 of the Subject Application, and claims 3 through 15, which depend from claim 2, are allowable.

Applicants also submit that neither Weissman nor Kamentsky discloses or suggests the method of claim 16 of the Subject Application. For example, Applicants submit that neither Weissman nor Kamentsky discloses or suggests a method that includes providing a single display showing an image of a portion of the slide and showing a plurality of control features; receiving, by receipt of a selection of one or more of the control features, a command to obtain an other image of at least part of the slide, the command specifying the other image as either previously-captured or for capture; and in response to the command, if the command specified the other image as previously-captured, retrieving a previously-captured of the other image and transmitting the previously-captured version to the single display, and if the command specified the other image as for

capture, capturing the other image and transmitting the captured other image to the single display.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 of the Subject Application, and claims 17 through 26, which depend from claim 16, are allowable.

Applicants also submit that neither Weissman nor Kamentsky discloses or suggests the method of claim 27 of the Subject Application. For example, Applicants submit that neither Weissman nor Kamentsky discloses or suggests a method that includes receiving an image of a portion of the slide and showing a plurality of control features and the image on a single display, selecting certain of the image control features and thereby requesting an other image specified as either previously-captured or for capture, and receiving the specified other image and showing the other image on the single display.


Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 of the Subject Application, and claims 28 through 35, which depend from claim 27, are allowable.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-35 are in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that no new matter has been introduced in the claims and other amendments included herein. Accordingly, passage to allowance of claims 2-35 at an early date is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that the Subject Application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney at the telephone number listed below so that any concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully Submitted



---

Eric D. Ruka  
Registration No. 45,060  
Attorney for Applicants

25 Churchill Road  
Pittsburgh, PA 15235  
Phone: (412) 243-8708  
Fax: (412) 243-4070  
eric@jamespatent.com